

- 6 -

REMARKS

The claims have been further amended to define the scope of the invention more clearly. It is believed that the claims as amended are now clearly patentably distinguished from the prior art.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 7, 13 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Rosensteel et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,167,405) in view of Coker (U.S. Patent Number 5,640,550).

It is respectfully submitted that these claims as amended herewith are clearly patentable over Rosensteel in view of Coker, and that even if the teachings of Rosensteel and Coker were combined, this would still not have taught or suggested the present invention to a person skilled in the art.

In particular, there is nothing in either Rosensteel or Coker to suggest the use of an aggregation directive as specified in the amended claims. Even if Coker's COBOL statements are viewed as "directives" as suggested by the examiner (detailed action, page 5, second paragraph), it is submitted that it is clear that none of these COBOL statements can be viewed as an aggregation directive as specified in the amended claims. More specifically, there is no suggestion that there exists any instruction in COBOL capable of specifying that data from a specified source table is to be aggregated into a specified destination table. Indeed, it should be noted that COBOL is record-based, and has no concept of tables.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that there is no suggestion in either Rosensteel or Coker of processing such an aggregation directive by accessing data models to pull information from entity-relationship data models about the structures of the source table and the destination table.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ST AVAILABLE COPY

- 7 -

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Rosensteel et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,167,405) in view of Coker (U.S. Patent Number 5,640,550) and further in view of Novalis (Access 97 Macro & VBA Handbook) and Backes et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,231,693).

It is respectfully submitted that claim 8 as amended herewith is clearly patentable over this combination of references.


Novalis describes the use of macros and Backes describes run-time binding of parameters. However, it is submitted that none of the references, considered separately or in combination would teach the method of claim 8. In particular, they would not teach or suggest that the step of running code includes searching a storage scheme file to find a storage scheme identified by a run-time processor macro and replacing the macro with a storage clause generated at run time from that storage scheme.

Conclusion

In summary, it is respectfully submitted that this application is clearly in order for allowance and such action is respectfully solicited.

August 13, 2004

Respectfully Submitted



William M. Lee, Jr.
Registration No. 26,935
Barnes & Thornburg
P.O. Box 2786
Chicago, Illinois 60690-2786
(312) 214-4800
Facsimile (312) 759-5646